

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION**

**JESSICA MISHOS,**

**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**MCKESSON CORPORATION,**

**Defendant.**

**Civil Action 2:22-cv-1666**

**Chief Judge Algenon L. Marbley**

**Magistrate Judge Kimberly A. Jolson**

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

On March 17, 2022, Plaintiff filed a motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). (Doc. 1). The Supreme Court, in *Adkins v. E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Co., Inc.*, set forth the legal standard applicable to a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*. 335 U.S. 331 (1948). An affidavit of poverty is sufficient if it reflects that the plaintiff cannot pay the court’s filing fee without depriving herself the “necessities of life.” *Id.* at 339 (internal quotation marks omitted). Although the plaintiff need not be totally destitute in order to proceed *in forma pauperis*, paying the filing fee must be more than a mere hardship. *See Foster v. Cuyahoga Dep’t of Health & Human Servs.*, 21 F. App’x 239, 240 (6th Cir. 2001) (noting that “the question is whether the court costs can be paid without undue hardship”). Consequently, unless it is clear that the one-time payment of the court’s filing fee will render the plaintiff unable to provide for herself, the court cannot grant her *in forma pauperis* status. *See Adkins*, 335 U.S. at 339.

In her affidavit, Plaintiff attests that she is currently employed and earns approximately \$3,988 per month and \$68,000 per year (Doc. 1 at 1). The Court notes that Plaintiff represented she will be terminated from her job on March 27, 2022. (*Id.* at 2). Plaintiff also attests that she has \$382.72 “in cash or in a checking or savings account[,]” and owns two significant assets, a home and car. (*Id.*). While Plaintiff does have some monthly expenses, including a home and car

payment, utilities, and a credit card payment, none of these are overly onerous. (*Id.*). Plaintiff represents she has two dependents and a partner but does not indicate if her partner contributes money to help pay for expenses. (*Id.* at 2).

Based on these representations, it does not appear that paying the one-time filing fee would cause Plaintiff to be deprived the necessities of life. *See Adkins*, 335 U.S. at 339; *see also Bush v. Ohio Dep't of Rehab. & Corr.*, No. 2:05-CV-0667, 2007 WL 4365381, at \*1 (S.D. Ohio Dec. 10, 2007) (noting that “[i]n *forma pauperis* status is usually reserved either for indigent prisoners or for persons who subsist on small fixed-income payments such as social security, unemployment compensation, or public assistance and who would truly be required to forego food, shelter, clothing, or some other necessity were they to devote any of their scant resources to paying a judicial filing fee”). Accordingly, it is **RECOMMENDED** that Plaintiff’s Motion for Leave to Proceed *in forma pauperis* (Doc. 1) be **DENIED**.

#### **Procedure on Objections**

If any party objects to this Report and Recommendation, that party may, within fourteen (14) days of the date of this Report, file and serve on all parties written objections to those specific proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made, together with supporting authority for the objection(s). A Judge of this Court shall make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made. Upon proper objections, a Judge of this Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made herein, may receive further evidence or may recommit this matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The parties are specifically advised that failure to object to the Report and Recommendation will result in a waiver of the right to have the District Judge review the Report

and Recommendation *de novo*, and also operates as a waiver of the right to appeal the decision of the District Court adopting the Report and Recommendation. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: March 18, 2022

/s/Kimberly A. Jolson  
KIMBERLY A. JOLSON  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE